#	Reviewer/ Affiliation	Page	Section	Comment/Rationale	Proposed Resolution	Committee Disposition
1	Tom		2.2.2.2.1 b	I'm not sure how one can "resolve"		Reworded bullet b.
	Mosher/			a report. Can someone illuminate		
	Garmin			the issue?		
2	Dean Miller	22	2.2.2	In WP13-06 (3/29/07 version)	Provide traceability for all	Traceability
	Boeing			there was a table with 3 columns:	requirements from table or the	Appendix X will be
				Interface	rationale for deleting them.	created to capture
				Requirements/Surveillance Processing/Application-Specific		traces to DO-289 assigned to Dean
				Processing Application-Specific Processing		Miller, Boeing
				Table has been deleted but I could		Willier, Boeing
				not identify all entries from table		
				in the latest version (WP15-04).		
3	Dean Miller	27	2.2.2.3.2.2.1	Sheila's action item (#77) was	Section author to update	Updated section per
	Boeing			presented and closed at March	accuracy requirement.	outcome of action
				2007 meeting.		item.
4	Larry		2.2.2.2	I can't think of a plausible	Take out the "/ADS-R"	Action: Paul Lipski
	Bachman/J			situation where ASSAP would		What is the
	HUAPL			have to correlate between ADS-R		probability of a service provider
				and TIS-B tracks, other than a massive screwup by the ground		producing a TIS-B
				infrastructure.		and ADS-R
						message for a
	_					single target?
5	J		2.2.2.2.1	Need to include what information	The old version of the MOPS	Added an
	Bachman/J			goes into a "track" or "source	referred to Table 3-4 of the ASA	assumption that the
	HUAPL			file".	MASPS. I think we need to go	ADS-B reports are
					through that table and select those data items that are truly	already subject to track initiation and
					minimum requirements for	maintenance
					initiating and updating a "track".	requirements.

#	Reviewer/	Page	Section	Comment/Rationale	Proposed Resolution	Committee
	Affiliation					Disposition
6	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.1.c	Second Tom's comment on "resolve".	Some of the requirements are vaguely worded and may need to be restated more clearly.	Reworded req
7	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.1.d	What does "[2] updates from the source" mean?	This is one of those that needs more clarity.	Deleted this req
8	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.1.f	This requirement is much more complex than indicated.	At a minimum, there should be some words about "If two 1090ES ADS-B reports are received by ASSAP from aircraft with the same address,", as well as a discussion of the situation and possibilities, e.g., incomplete state vector reports, etc.	Reworded req to be based on reported accuracy.
9	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.1.g	This requirement is pretty tough. In order for this situation to occur, the ground infrastructure would have to mess up. This function is supposed to happen on the ground. Is it reasonable to expect that the avionics should be able to do something that the ground processing could not do?	Remove the requirement.	Rewrote this section real time. Take a look and see what you think.
1 0	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.1.a	Impossible to guarantee for every case. What if ADS-B position source or radar is malfunctioning? Again, this function is supposed to be done on the ground.	At least put in some probability of correlating.	Rewrote this section
1	Larry Bachman/J		2.2.2.2.1.b	Impossible to guarantee for every case. What if ADS-B position	At least put in some probability of correlating.	Rewrote this section

#	Reviewer/ Affiliation	Page	Section	Comment/Rationale	Proposed Resolution	Committee Disposition
	HUAPL			source or radar is malfunctioning? Again, this function is supposed to be done on the ground.		
1 2	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.2.a	Impossible to guarantee for every case. What if ADS-B position source or radar is malfunctioning? Again, this function is supposed to be done on the ground.	At least put in some probability of correlating.	Rewrote this section
1 3	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.2.b	Impossible to guarantee for every case. What if ADS-B position source or radar is malfunctioning? Again, this function is supposed to be done on the ground.	At least put in some probability of correlating.	Rewrote this section
1 4	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.2	Shouldn't the note be a requirement?	Change the note to a requirement, unless this is already done in the CDTI part of the document.	Rewrote this section
1 5	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.3	Where do numbers in requirements come from?	Provide analysis to support numbers.	Took the numbers out
1 6	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.3	Don't understand the purpose of the table.	If the table is to be followed, make it a requirement. If not, then what do we need it for? Also, some of the entries correspond to nearly impossible cases, which ASSAP processors should not waste time on.	Took the table out
1 7	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.3.1-3	Needs work – no explanation or justification given.	Add explanatory text and, if necessary, analysis. Also, if these requirements are the only ones, get rid of sections and put	Rewrote this section

#	Reviewer/ Affiliation	Page	Section	Comment/Rationale	Proposed Resolution	Committee Disposition
					under 2.2.2.2.3.	
1	Larry		2.2.2.4.a	Have maximum coast intervals	Add definition and justification	Yes
8	Bachman/J HUAPL			been defined?	for max. coast intervals. Also need expository material.	
1 9	Larry Bachman/J HUAPL		2.2.2.2.5	Needs expository material and clearer requirements.	Add text and clarify requirements.	Made an attempt